

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/063,220 | Applicant(s) ROBINSON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Amir Alavi | Art Unit 2621 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Amir Alavi. (3) _____
 (2) Mr. G.W. Thielman (Reg. 43,186). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 May 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of record.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: We discussed the latest proposed amendment, however, Examiner noted that wherein, "determining whether the at least one object warrants further decomposition" also, "synthesizing a document template containing the at least one design attribute and the at least one design sub attribute" do not appear to have support in the specification. In conclusion we agreed that upon further amendments to the claims in light of the specification, Examiner would further reconsider this application for patentability .